

4. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device according to claim [2] 18, wherein the light shielding layers and the light shielding frame layer are formed through an electrochemical reaction.

C2  
Sub  
g1  
5. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device according to claim [1] 18, wherein the light shielding frame layer [includes a plurality of colored layers of] is formed of three different [colors] filters, one of said filters being red, one of said filters being green and one of said filters being blue.

C3  
7. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device according to claim [1] 18, wherein said first insulative substrate further comprises a driving circuit for driving the switching elements, and the light shielding frame layer is formed over the driving circuit.

#### REMARKS

This is in response to the Official Action that is currently outstanding with respect to the above-identified application.

Claims 1-17 were presented for reconsideration in the last Amendment filed in the above-identified application. Claim 6 stands as objected to, and Claims 1-17 stand rejected. By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 6 and 8-17 have been canceled, without prejudice. In addition, Claim 18 has been added to replace Claim 1, and Claims 3-5 and 7 have been amended. Accordingly, upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 3-5, 7 and 18 will remain pending in this application.

In the currently outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Acknowledged Applicants' claim of foreign priority under 35 USC 119(a)-(d), and confirmed the safe receipt of the priority document for this application by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
2. Rejected Claim 6 under 35 USC 112 on the bases that there is no proper antecedent basis for the term "the plurality of colored layers" at line 2 of Claim 6.
3. Rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ohgawara et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,230) in view of the Kadota et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,550).

With regard to item 1, further detailed discussion in these Remarks is not believed to be necessary.

With regard to item 2, Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice, by the foregoing Amendment. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of that claim under 35 USC 112 is believed to be moot.

With regard to item 3, it is again noted that Claims 1, 2, 6 and 8-17 have been canceled by the foregoing Amendment. Also, Claim 18 has been added to replace Claim 1, and Claims 3-5 and 7 have been amended for clarity and so as to depend from new Claim 18.

With regard to the substance of the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC 103(a), it first is respectfully noted that in the Kadota et al. reference neither of the substrates disclosed includes light shielding frame layers. In addition, Claim 18 now makes it abundantly clear that the problem being solved by the present invention is reducing the complexity of adhering a TFT substrate to a counter substrate in the manufacture of a liquid crystal display device. Accordingly, since there is now a specific reference in the claims to the problem being solved, it is believed that the Examiner's basis for rejecting Applicants' argument that there is no motivation to modify the Kadota et al reference because it is addressed to different problems than the present invention has been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Kadota et al patent referred to as a reference above, therefore, is respectfully requested in response to this communication for the reason set forth in detail in response to the last Official Action in this case.

With regard to the Ohgawara et al reference, Applicants respectfully note that that reference is quite similar to the subject matter discussed in the Background of the Invention section of the present specification. Specifically, Ohgawara et al requires a highly precise alignment of the substrates during their attachment to one another. Thus, it will be seen from several passages in the Ohgawara et al patent (Col. 3, lines 36-42; Col.4, lines 33-37; Col. 9, lines 35-42; Col. 11, lines 54-64; and Col. 14, lines 35-45, among others) that that patent contemplates the formation of row electrodes in a striped pattern on one substrate, and the formation of column electrodes in a striped pattern on the other substrate. Then, the substrates are attached together so that the rows and columns intersect to form a highly twisted crystal cell (Col. 11, lines 54-64).

Therefore, it is required in Ohgawara et al that the substrates be adhered together such that the intersections of the row electrodes and the column electrodes correspond to the respective color filters. It also is required that the attachment be such that the light shielding layer corresponds to the edge portions of the picture elements at the periphery of the display region.

The present invention is different. In the present invention, a TFT substrate includes TFT's, color filters, light shielding frame layers and light shielding layers corresponding to the TFT's. Accordingly, the counter substrate only needs to have counter electrodes (see, present specification, page 19, line 16 to page 20, line 2). Furthermore, the counter electrodes are formed on almost the entire surface of the counter substrate in the present invention. This is quite different from the highly twisted liquid crystal cell of the Ohgawara et al patent. Hence, unlike the reference patent, the present invention is not affected even if a displacement occurs during the attachment of the TFT substrate to the counter electrode substrate. This drastically simplifies the attachment of the substrates to each other without adverse affect upon the quality of the resulting liquid crystal display device.

For each, and all, of the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that Claims 3-5, 7 and 18 of this application, as they will stand upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application, therefore, is respectfully requested.

Applicants also believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS  
& CUSHMAN, LLP

Date: May 3, 2000

By: David A. Tucker  
David A. Tucker  
Reg. No. 27,840  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
130 Water Street  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
(617-523-3400)